MYSORE POLICE (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider.

* Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move :

> "That the Mysore Police (Second Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಅಗತ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಎರಡು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿವೆ. ಒಂದನೆಯದು ಮೈಸೂರು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ 1908; ಇದು ಆಗಿಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಲಾಟರೀಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಪ್ರೈಸ್ ಕಾಂಪಿಟಿಷನ್ ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ 1951. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿನ 4ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಿವರಣೆ (definition) ಇದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ gaming ಎಂದರೆ ಏನೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ.

> (1) "Gaming does not include a lottery but includes all forms of wagering or betting, except wagering, or betting on horse race when such wagering or betting takes place—
>
> (i) on the date on which such race is run; and
>
> (ii) in an enclosure which the license of the race course on which such race is to be run, has set apart for the purpose under the terms of the licence issued under section 4 of the Mysore Race Course Licensing Act, 1952 (Mysore Act VIII of 1952) in respect of such race course."

In sub-clause (2) the definition of the 'instruments of gaming' is given. Sub-clause (3) gives the definition of 'common gaming house'.

ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಓ.ಸಿ. ಅಥವಾ ಸಟ್ಟಾ ಆಟವೆಂದು ಆಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಆಟದ ನಿಯಮವೇನು, ಇದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇದೊಂದು ಜೂಜಿನ ಆಟ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣಕಟ್ಟುವವನು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 'ಸಿಂಗಲ್ ಡಿಜಿಟ್' ಮತ್ತು 'ಡಬ್ಬಲ್ ಡಿಜಿಟ್' ಎಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಮೇರಿಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತಿಯ ಬೆಲೆ Opening ಮತ್ತು Closing ಹೀಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. Single digit bet ಆದರೆ, ಇವನು ಹೇಳಿದಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬಂದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂಟರಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಇವನಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ; Double digit ಆದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂಭತ್ತರಷ್ಟು, ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿದರೆ 80 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇವನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಅಂಕಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ. ಇದು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಈ ಆಟದ ಸ್ವಭಾವ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಲಿ ಈ ಆಟ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಆಟ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಲು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದುದು ನಾನು ವಾಸವಾಗಿರುವ ದಾವಣಗೆರೆ ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹತ್ತಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರವೂ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ. ಓ.ಸಿ. ಆಟವೆಂದು ಬಹಳ ಜನರು ಆಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ನಾನಂತೂ ಆಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಓ.ಸಿ. ಆಟದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರು ಮನೆಮಾರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನರು ಹುಚ್ಚು ಹಿಡಿದು ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕರು ಮಾಡಬಾರದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಕಣ್ಣಾರೆ ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಲಕ್ಷಾಧೀಶ್ವರರು ಭಿಕ್ಷುಕರಾಗಿ ಬಿದ್ದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ವಿ. ರಾಮರಾವ್ (ತುಮಕೂರು).—ಓ.ಸಿ. ಆಟವೆಂದರೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—Opening and Closing rates of cotton ಎಂದು.

10 A.M.

ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ತಾ॥ 16-7-53ರನೆಯ ಡೆಕ್ಕನ್‌ಹೆರಾಲ್ಡ್ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಒಂದು ಕಟ್ಟಿಂಗನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯೂಯಾರ್ಕ್ ಕಾಟನ್ ವಿಚಾರ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಜುಲೈ 15ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಟನ್ ಓಪನಿಂಗ್ ರೇಟ್ 34·04 ಎಂತಲೂ ಕಾಟನ್ ಕ್ಲೋಸಿಂಗ್ ರೇಟು 34.05 ಎಂತಲೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂಕಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಯುಲೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಅಂಕಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕರೆಕ್ಟಾದರೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂಟರಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಎರಡು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳೂ ಕರೆಕ್ಟಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 80ರಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರಂತೆ; ಇದನ್ನು ಸಟ್ಟಾ ಆಟ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈಗ ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಇದರ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಪತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿದೆ. ಗಂಡ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ತಟ್ಟೆ-ಬಟ್ಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ಗಿರಿವಿಟ್ಟು ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಈ ಸಟ್ಟ ಆಟಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಿ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ಆ ಗಂಡಹೆಂಡರಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯ ಬಂದು ಆ ಸಂಸಾರವೇ ಒಡೆದುಹೋಗುವಂಥಾ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ, ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅನೇಕ ವರದಿಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತುತ್ತಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಗೀಡಾಗಿವೆ. ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹುಡುಗರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಆಟಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ತಂದೆತಾಯಿಗಳು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟ ದುಡ್ಡು ಕಾಸುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೊಡೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಈ ಸಟ್ಟಾ ಆಟಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಮಗೆ ವರದಿಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಕಳ್ಳತನಗಳಿಗೂ ಈ ಆಟವೇ ಕಾರಣವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ವರ್ತ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರ ಹಾವಳಿ ಎಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಪೋಲೀಸ್‌ನವರು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾನೂನು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ತಮಗೆ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಂತಸ್ತಿನ ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ಈ ಆಟಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಆಟದ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಕೂಲಿಗಾರರಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರವರೆಗೂ ಬಿದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂದು ಬಲಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಾಳಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಯಾವ ಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೂ ಈ ಆಟದ ಟಿಕೆಟ್‌ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಜನರು ಕ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಜೂಜಾಟ ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂಬುದು ಈ ಜನರು ಕ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಂತಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೇ ತಮಗೆ ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಚಾರ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಹಾಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳುಂಟಾಗುವಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದು ಹರಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈ ಜೂಜಾಟದಿಂದ ಏನೇನು ಕೇಡುಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪುನಃ ವಿವರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಜೂಜೆಂಬುದು ಮಹಾ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಇದು ಯಾರನ್ನೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. 'ಜೂಜಾಡಿ ಕೆಟ್ಟರು ಪಂಚಪಾಂಡವರು' ಎಂದು ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತೇ ಇದೆ. ಧರ್ಮರಾಯನನ್ನು ಶಕುನಿಯು ಜೂಜಿಗೆ ಕರೆದಾಗ ಆ ವಿದ್ಯೆ ನನಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಾರದೆಂಬ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಕಟ್ಟುಬಿದ್ದು ಧರ್ಮರಾಯ ಪಗಡೆಯ ಆಟಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿ ತನ್ನ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ವಸ್ವವನ್ನೂ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಾಗ್ಯೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಡದೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ತನ್ನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯನ್ನೇ ಒತ್ತೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಜೂಜಾಡಿದ ವಿಚಾರ ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂ (ಜಗಳೂರು).— ಅಂಥ ಮಹನೀಯರೇ ಆಡಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವೇಕೆ ಆಡಬಾರದು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಜೂಜಿಗೆ ನಿಂತ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅವರ ವರ್ತನೆಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಮುಟ್ಟುತ್ತವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಜೂಜಾಟಗಳು ದಿನೇ ದಿನೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಂತೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕ್ಯಾಂಟೀನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ಲಬ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಇದರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ರಾತ್ರಿಯೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿದ್ರೆಗೆಟ್ಟು ಆಡುತ್ತಿರುವಂಥ ಜನರು ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಜೂಜಾಟದಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ತತ್ರಾಪಿ ಕೂಲಿಗಾರರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮಧ್ಯಮ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಪೋಲೀಸಿನವರೂ ಅನೇಕ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರು. ಆ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರೆಗೂ ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ನಡೆಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಈ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಿಂಗಲ್ ಬೆಂಚಿಗೆ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆಗ ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್ ಬಾಲಕೃಷ್ಣಯ್ಯನವರು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬೆಂಚ್ ಆಫ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಿತ್ತರು. ಆಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಬೆಂಚ್ ಆಫ್ ಜಡ್ಜಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಡಿಫರಿಂಗ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಂದು ಜಸ್ಟೀಸ್ ವಾಸುದೇವಮೂರ್ತಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಪನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಹ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು, ಇದು ಅತ್ಯಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ, ಕಡೆಗೆ ಅಪರಾಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖುಲಾಸೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಅಪರಾಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖುಲಾಸೆ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಜಡ್ಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನ concluding ಪ್ಯಾರಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ :

"Before leaving this case I must add, that there is no doubt that this particular form of gambling which, it appears, is enormously on the increase is pernicious and reprehensible and the State must put it down. I think this present decision may furnish the reason or opportunity to amend the Mysore Police Act or Section 12 of the Mysore Betting Tax Act IX of 1932 to bring it in conformity with the corresponding Madras and Calcutta Acts, so that all forms of serious and harmful wagering may be more clearly and readily punishable."

This judgment was delivered on 8th July 1953.

ಇದಾದ ನಂತರ ಈ ಸಟ್ಟಾ ಎಂಬ ಜೂಜಾಟವನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿತು. ಆ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಮತ್ತು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಗೇಮಿಂಗ್ ಎಂಬ ಡೆಫೆನಿಷನ್ನಿನ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದರ ಸ್ಕೋಪನ್ನು ಎನ್‌ಲಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಜೂಜಾಟಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಆಕ್ಟಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (8)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಬಹಳ ರೆಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟೀವ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಗೇಮಿಂಗ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದದ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ವೇಜರಿಂಗ್, ಬೆಟ್ಟಿಂಗ್, ವರ್ಡ್ಸ್ ಕಾಂಪಿಟಿಷನ್ ಸಟ್ಟಾ ಜೂಜು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಯಾದ ಬಗೆಯ ಜೂಜೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಯಾವ ವಸ್ತುಗಳೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳಗೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಈಗ ವಿಸ್ತಾರಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (38)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದರ ಸ್ಕೋಪು ಬಹಳ ರೆಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿವ್ ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಾವೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ನಾಲ್ಕರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 56ನ್ನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (63)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವ

ಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನ್ಸಿಕ್ವೆನ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಬೆಟ್ಟಿಂಗ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (2 ರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಒಳಕ್ಲಾಜು (1) ಮತ್ತು (2)ರನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಆವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದುದರಿಂದ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಾವಣಿಕೆಯಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ, to make this Act foolproof and knaveproof, ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲ, ಈ ಗ್ಯಾಂಬ್ಲಿಂಗ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ಇದರಿಂದ ಸಮಾಜಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ಕೇಡನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು, ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ತೀರ್ಮಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Police (Second Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—May I submit with regard to this Bill, that it was placed before us day before yesterday. As the House is aware and you are aware, the House was wholly occupied in debating the Demands for Supplementary and Additional Grants. To-day we have met in the morning and we have hardly had time to look into the provisions of the Bill. Since this is an Amending Bill, it would be necessary to study the relevant connected provisions not only of the Police Act but all the other Acts to which reference has been made and to know what effect, if any, the particular judgment has upon those definitions. So far as I can see, this matter does require some more little study before anybody can speak with information upon any point. So far as I am concerned, it is not possible to understand the Amending Bill without having some time to study. If the Hon'ble Minister has no objection, since the motion for consideration has been moved he might, I think, agree to give us some time to study the relevant provisions and make our contribution to this debate. Another difficulty we have is, we have to go to the Legislature Library and obtain the relevant Acts and spend some time to look into them and equip ourselves with a view to make our suggestions or observations. In the light of these difficulties, would the Minister be agreeable to give us a little time to study the Act or will he have it debated without giving that opportunity ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—But the copies of the Bill were distributed on the 15th instant, 3 days back, and it was announced that it will be taken up to-day just last evening. If the Hon'ble Members so desire to postpone the discussion on this Bill, it is left to the Hon'ble Minister to say that.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—To-day we have not time to study. I entirely agree with Sri Rama Rao. We have not yet applied our minds to this Bill. All these Bills may be taken up after the Andhra State Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before the motion was moved by the Minister, this might have been suggested.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—What I want to say is that this Bill may be taken up for consideration just before the Appropriation Bill and the Appropriation Bill itself may be kept a little lower down in the schedule of business.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—So far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned, there is no question of keeping it lower down or any such thing.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What the Hon'ble Member says is that he has no serious objection to taking it up a little later on.

* Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—This Bill has to go to the Upper House and the Upper House is scheduled to close on Monday. It is quite possible that they might keep up to their schedule. I do not know what exactly is their position because I am not aware of the proceedings of that House for the last two days. Now the position is this : If this Bill

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

does not become law during the course of the Session, I am afraid, the country will be put to a lot of inconvenience. There is a lot of clamour or demand from the public that we will have to stop and prevent this kind of gambling going on and that too, after the decision of the High Court. Now, in view of the fact that there is a decision of the High Court that it is not an offence, it has increased. Therefore, I most earnestly appeal to the Hon'ble Members of this House to enable me to get this Bill passed into law by going through the process in the Upper House also. Otherwise I could not have had any objection at all. The compelling factor is the time factor. I desire to take it up in the Upper House at a very early date before it is closed. In view of this, I have to regret that it may not be possible to give further time for the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet at 10-45 A.M.

The House rose for Lunch at Ten Minutes past Ten of the Clock and reassembled at Forty-five Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri M. V. Rama Rao's point is there for consideration. The Bill seems to be important and urgent as explained by the Hon'ble Minister because it has to be brought before the other House. In view of this particular circumstance, Sri Rama Rao may not be very serious of raising his point. Otherwise, it will have to be taken up during the next session. That means a delay of some few months. In the meanwhile, the harm that would naturally follow would take place: because the sittings of the other House will be over by Wednesday. That is what I understood.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Therefore if we can proceed on the debate today there will still be time for the Government to take up the Bill before the other House.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—May I request the Minister in charge of this Bill to inform me if this Bill includes the games that take place in various Clubs such as the Cosmopolitan Club, the Century Club and other Clubs where cards are played and a system of gambling goes on. I would like to know if this Bill embraces all those institutions where a kind of gambling goes on.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—So far as that position is concerned, whoever comes within the provisions of the Bill, as is now going to be amended—they will all be dealt with, but I am not so sure whether a play of cards comes within the definition as is now desired, because the essential point is this: If it is a game of skill, it will not be a gambling or a game for any profit by way of illegal means. It should be one of pure question of chance, speculation and an event which cannot be foreseen. But it is said that in some of the games that are played in the Club there is a preponderant element of skill, although betting is there. Therefore, if any kind of game comes within the definition of the Act that is now going to be introduced, law has not made any exception about the place where this kind of game takes place. It is a matter for judicial interpretation whether a game is a game of chance or skill. That is an essential ingredient you will have to bear in mind.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—When you are introducing this Bill, it is very necessary to make this point clear. When it is doubtful whether a play of cards is a game of skill or chance, I would like to know, if the point is kept vague, will it not lead to litigation again? The High Court may interpret in a different manner. Therefore I would like the Hon'ble

Minister to ponder over this question and consult the experts in the matter and make the point very clear in this Bill.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Expert opinion has been taken, the relevant provisions in Bombay and Madras Acts have been looked into and the present Bill has been introduced with a view to rectify the defects or the lacunae that is found with regard to the legal aspect of the case. The intention of the Government is that all kinds of wagerings or bettings wherein there is merely a chance or speculation and not a game of skill, will have to be prohibited and we cannot think of prohibiting games where skill is involved and it is from that object the meaning of the word 'game' has been defined under several judicial interpretations and I may bring to the notice of the House a quotation from a passage from the Judgment of the High Court wherein they say :

" ....the legal meaning of the word 'gaming' is there—

(i) Wagering or betting upon a horse except under the circumstances specified and excluding a lottery,

(ii) Wagering or betting generally,

(iii) Gaming in the ordinary and popular sense for which Section 66 of the Act makes specific provision.

" Gaming is playing at any game, sport, pastime or exercise, lawful or unlawful for money or any other valuable thing which is staked on the result of the game, *i.e.*, which is to be lost or won according to the success or failure of the person who has staked.

" Wagering which includes betting is making a contract on an uncertain event, past or future, in which the parties have no pecuniary interest other than that created by the contract by which the parties are to gain or lose according as the uncertainty is determined one way or the other."

Therefore I could appreciate the feeling of the Hon'ble Member when he says that all kinds of games wherein pecuniary gain or loss is involved will have to be prohibited, if I have understood him correctly; but I cannot do it because the definition of the word 'game' wherever found, anywhere, even in the Law Lexicon and several other authorities, is very clear; the import of that word is very clear. There should be no element of skill; there must be only the element of mere chance, speculation. Then only we will have to prohibit the game. Supposing in a game if there is an element of skill, I am afraid possibly I cannot prevent that game being played, whatever may be the pecuniary gain or loss involved in it.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—During Ugadi, Deepavali, Holi festivals and other festivals, people indulge merely for the sake of pleasure, as a matter of delight and joy, in some games where money is staked and I would like to know if such games where joy or delight is the chief object, would be included in this Bill.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—If joy or delight is to be found only by speculation, that is prohibited. Even in cards playing, there are varieties of games such as Parel, Ranisal, Poker, etc., which come under this Bill.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Hon'ble Minister is an expert in Poker !

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI (Mysore City—South).—I am sure the Hon'ble Minister is also aware that in some of the important Clubs not only they play cards wherein skill is used but also quite a number of members indulge in cards playing where there may be speculation. If the Minister wants some evidence, I would request him to kindly come with me to a club in Mysore and I

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI).
will show him his own officers playing cards, which is not a game of skill.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—Please mention the name of the game.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMI.—For instance, Pick and Parel (known as game of three cards). Just now Sri P. R. Ramaiya raised a very pertinent point, *viz.*, whether this amending Bill would embrace also these Clubs where even games of a speculative character go on. I personally know that in some of the Clubs this sort of game is played and the players not only spend money, but also they will be away from their work and as such, in case those Clubs or places where this gaming is going on, are not included in this amending Bill, I think the object of the Bill would be frustrated and if really Government are interested in prohibiting a game like Satta or playing Parel or Pick where people lose money and bring ruin upon themselves and their families, they need make no sort of discrimination between a Club where officers and other important people join and play all these games and other places where Satta and other types of gambling are played by the people. If officers play in Clubs they may be excused whereas ordinary people, if they play such games, will be hauled up by the Police. Such sort of discrimination should not be allowed.

11 A.M.

As a matter of fact, I was about to congratulate the Government for having brought this Bill. But I wish Government had looked into all these matters before this Bill was introduced.

* Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Yes, Sir. The Government have certainly looked into this matter before this Bill has been introduced. I invite the Hon'ble Member's attention to sub-clause (3) of clause 2 of the proposed Bill, where common gaming house has been defined. I am not able to lay my hand on the decision of the Madras High Court on this particular point, whether a club comes under the definition of common gaming house. Unfortunately, I have not got the decision with me now. I shall try to get it. The central theme is this. Supposing in a club, although it is a registered association, its members indulge in a kind of game which comes under the category of this definition, I am sure they will be under no canopy of protection, because they play that game in a club. Supposing they play a game which does not come under the category of this Act, or the game is not offensive, or in which there are not the necessary ingredients to call it a game as has been defined here, I am sure, they will be protected. For instance, in your Mysore Club, if members play the game of *Ranisal* or *Parel*,—I do not know whether my friend has any experience of these games,—I am sure they will be hauled up, irrespective of whether it is played in a club or not.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Srirangapatna).—Hauled up, by whom, Sir?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—By the Police. I am sure that if any building comes within the definition of sub-cluase (3) of clause 2 and if any kind of game is indulged in there which becomes an offence under the Act, whatever may be the play, there will be no protection for it. But there are any number of decisions and probably my lawyer friends are aware that whenever a particular question goes before a judicial tribunal or before the Courts, a decision is given looking into the case as to what is the element of chance, what is the element of skill and whether it can be considered to be one where it is merely speculation or whether it comes within the category of wager—all these things will be taken into consideration. Therefore I may assure my Hon'ble friend that there is no intention on the part of the Government to exclude any place where this kind of game is indulged

in, which we now propose to prohibit by means of this Act.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I should like to speak on this Bill. May I make a suggestion, Sir? It seems to me that the urgency of this bill has not been satisfactorily established by the Government. The more my friend the Hon'ble the Minister for Home Affairs explains the intricacies, the subtleties and the niceties of gaming and gambling, the less does he convince this House of the urgency for passing this legislation without examining the clauses to which I will presently invite his attention. Now the Statement of Objects and Reasons goes on to say that in a recent case decided by the High Court—I presume it is our own High Court and I think, if I have heard my friend aright, the judgment was in the month of July 1953....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—July 7th.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Now, Sir, in a recent decision by the High Court of Mysore on 7th July 1953, a person convicted for gaming in Satta by staking money on the opening and closing rates of New York Cotton, was acquitted on the ground that the provisions relating to gaming in the Mysore Police Act did not cover this type of gambling. It has also been vouchsafed that this particular type of gaming is reprehensible and that the State must put it down and that the Mysore Police Act may be suitably amended. I entirely agree with the Hon'ble the Home Minister that the defects in the meaning or definition of gaming in the Police Act, as they are now discovered by the judgment of the High Court, should be suitably remedied. But while we seek to remedy those defects, we should not decline to take notice of the other consequential changes that will have to be effected in the light of those amendments. It is not as if Government, in the exercise of police vigilance made the discovery that a number of persons are engaged in this form of gaming or gambling and are ruining themselves, their families and their dependents. Except the reference to the High Court judgment, I really have not been able to see what other material the Hon'ble Minister has placed at the disposal of this House with regard to the number of persons who kept such gaming houses, or the suspected large number of persons who are engaged in this gambling and the number of families ruined and whether any such cases have come to the notice of the Government in the course of administration. It is all very well to claim that we seek to put down gambling or any other evil. It is certainly right to seek to do so. But what I am trying to bring to the notice of the Government is that, as long as the amendment does not meet or does not fulfil the purpose which the Government have in amending the law, they should not be in a hurry to proceed with the Bill and amend the law in a hurry. It should be clear to my friend the Hon'ble the Home Minister that clause 2 of this Bill, which seeks to amend clause (i) of section 4 of the Mysore Police Act 1908, will not meet the requirements of the case. I shall point out to him the relevant clauses not only in the Mysore Police Act, but also in the connected Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act of 1951, to which reference has been made in clause 7 of this Bill. Sir, the definition of "Common gaming house" contained in clause (i) of section 4 of the Mysore Police Act is like this:

> "(i) 'Common gaming house' means any building, enclosure, room, place, or vehicle in which cards, dice, tables or other instruments of gaming are kept or used for the profit or gain of the person owning, occupying, using or keeping such building, enclosure, room, place, or vehicle whether by way of

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

charge for the use of instruments of gaming, or of the building, enclosure, room, place or vehicle or otherwise howsoever."

Now this clause is not going to be amended in any restricted sense of the word amendment. It is actually being substituted by an exhaustive definition of what a gaming house will be. The Hon'ble Minister did explain that the word "gaming" itself is not defined. But authorities like the Police, the Law Courts and lawyers and others have a fairly accurate idea of what gaming really means. The exact ingredients which go to make up gaming are so clear that it is necessary to define it. Clause (i) of section 4 is sought to be substituted by the proposed amendment contained in clause 2 of this Bill. There it is said :

"'Gaming' does not include a lottery but includes all forms of wagering or betting, except wagering or betting on a horse race when such wagering or betting takes place—

(i) on the date on which such race is run ; and

(ii) in an enclosure which the licensee of the race-course on which such race is to be run, has set apart for the purpose under the terms of the license issued under section 4 of the Mysore Race-Courses Licensing Act, 1952, (Mysore Act VIII of 1952), in respect of such race-course ; and

(iii) between any person, being present in the enclosure, on the one hand, and such licensee or other person licenced by such licensee in terms of the aforesaid licence on the other hand in such manner and by such contrivance as may be permitted by such licence."

It is quite clear that, so far as the first part of this clause in the Bill is concerned, the object is to make an exception in the case of the Race Club or the Turf Club that runs these horse races. Then the Explanation goes on to say :

"*Explanation*.—For the purposes of this definition, wagering or betting shall be deemed to include the collection or soliciting of bets, the receipt or distribution of winnings or prizes, in money or otherwise, in respect of any wager or bet, or any act which is intended to aid or facilitate wagering or betting or such collection, soliciting, receipt or distribution."

Then, instruments of gaming are thus described :

"'instruments of gaming' include any article used or intended to be used as a subject, or means of, gaming, any document used or intended to be used as a register or record or evidence of any gaming, the proceeds of any gaming, and any winnings or prizes in money or otherwise distributed or intended to be distributed in respect of any gaming."

It is significant that instruments of gaming or gambling such as cards, dice, tables or other instruments of gaming referred to in the original definition have been omitted.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—It has been omitted advisedly.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—It is significant that they have been deliberately omitted. The definition has been made much wider so as to include these or any other, for instance, *hunuse bija* (Tamarind seeds) *balapa* (Slate pencils) *kaddichuru* (bits of wood), etc., and as to the persons who indulge in these games—I do not know if the common

people in the State will be able to know the far-reaching implications of the legislation we propose to make to-day. It is rather far-reaching. That is what I am trying to bring to the notice of the Government. Common Gaming-house is defined in sub-clause (3) of clause 2 of the Bill as follows :

> "'Common gaming house' means a building, enclosure, room, place or vehicle in which any instruments of gaming are kept or used for the profit or gain of the person owning or occupying such building, etc."

Sir, I should like to know....

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—May I intervene, Sir? Gaming as defined in the original Act is in a negative sense, whereas we have now made it positive.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—The whole definition has been recast.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—You will be pleased to see the definiton of gaming in the original Act. It says: "It does not include"; in a negative sense, it is defined. That is exactly why the judicial interpretation in our High Court is that this definition is not exhaustive.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Which is the definition the Hon'ble Minister is referring to?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am referring to the definition of gaming contained in the original Act—the Mysore Police Act of 1908, wherein......

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Which Section and which clause?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Section 4, clause (i).

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Gaming is not defined.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There, the definition of gaming was in a negative sense, whereas, here, we have amplified it by bringing in its orbit all kinds of gaming which are not found in the original Act.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I am grateful to the Minister for the light which he sought to throw upon the point. But it does not illumine the point at all. As a matter of fact, clause (i) of Section 4 to which he refers now does not define 'gaming'. What it has defined is common gaming house. If we examine the Section carefully, we will find that it does not state expressly or impliedly what 'gaming' means. "Common Gaming-house means any building, enclosure, room, place, or vehicle in which cards, dice, tables or other instruments of gaming are kept or used for the profit or gain of the person owning . . ."

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Gaming includes all forms of wagering or betting.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I know my friend the Hon'ble Minister is really referring to Section 4 of clause (i) of the Police Act. We are incorporating this definition of what gaming is. We are doing that now. But the original Act contains only the definition of what a common gaming-house is. We seek to amend the Act and provide a definition not only of 'gaming' but also of Common Gaming-house as we find from part (1) and part (3). Then part (2) deals with instruments of gaming. As I pointed out earlier we are enlarging the scope of the definition. We are enlarging the scope so widely that it is likely to include all forms of sport, even indoor sports. The amendment of Section 38 of the Mysore Police Act—Mysore Act V of 1908—through clause 3 is for substituting the word 'gaming' for the word 'gambling' used in that Section. Now, my point is, if this definition of gaming is satisfactory to us, then the substitution of that word there in the place of 'gambling' will certainly meet the object that Government have in view. But since the definition of 'gaming' is made unreasonably wide and includes forms of sport in respect of which Government ought to make

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

proper allowances, I think we should make this amendment in a different form altogether. Clause 7 says that in clause (*e*) of sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act, 1951, sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) shall be omitted. Sir, it is very necessary to advert to what is contained in these sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) of clause (*e*) of sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act, 1951. In Section 2 of Act XXVII of 1951, in clause (*e*) prize competition is defined in the following terms :

> " Prize competition " includes—
>
> (i) cross-word prize competition, missing words prize competition, picture prize competition, number prize competition, or any other competition for which the solution is prepared beforehand by the promoters of the competition or for which the solution is determined by lot ; "

This sub-clause is proposed to be retained under this amending Bill. Now, sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) of clause (*e*) of the same Section say :

> "(ii) any competition in which prizes are offered for forecasts of the results either of a future event or of a past event the result of which is not yet ascertained or not yet generally known ; and
>
> (iii) any other competition success in which does not depend to a substantial degree upon the exercise of skill ; "

These sub-clauses we propose to delete by this Bill. I should like to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister that by the deletion of these two parts in clause (*e*), of Section 2 will have a definition of prize competition more unsatisfactory than we now find it. After the deletion of parts (ii) and (ii) of this clause, prize competition " includes cross-word prize competition, missing words prize competition, picture prize competition, number prize competition, or any other competition for which the solution is prepared beforehand by the promoters of the competition, etc." There is no question of skill, or any substantial degree of skill. This is a thing to which he must give careful consideration. That is what I am trying to point out. It would therefore be necessary if we retain in the definition only sub-clause (i) of clause (*e*) of sub-section (1) of Section 2 to include the words " where it depends to a substantial degree upon the exercise of skill ". The inclusion of these words in the amended definition of prize competition will be very necessary. I am sure I have made that point clear to the Hon'ble Minister for Home Affairs. This will be more clear if I advert to Section 8 of Act XXVII of 1951. Section 8 says :

> " A prize competition shall not be deemed to be an unlawful prize competition, if a licence in respect of such competition has been obtained by the promoter thereof."

Sir, this will be a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, if I may say so. This definition must and can certainly be improved. But altogether omitting the words " exercise of skill " in the case of a prize competition and also making it lawful for a person to carry on any such prize competition merely by obtaining a licence from Government is hardly the way of dealing with legislation of this kind. I am sure, this cannot be the object of the Government at all. I am perfectly certain that there is no difference in approach so far as I am concerned and so far as the Home Minister is concerned. We seek to do the very thing which the High Court has pointed out but I am suggesting to him that the Bill he has now brought will not go to the extent and will leave this loophole whereby

executive action is likely to frustrate the very object for which this amending legislation is brought. Therefore I would suggest to him that so long as we retain Section 8 in the enactment, it is our moral duty to define "prize competition" in a manner in which the ingredient of exercise of skill a substantial measure for success in it is contained in the definition of prize competition. We must do that if we want to retain Section 8 of this Act. If we want to amend the definition of Prize Competition so as to exclude a prize competition where the exercise of skill is necessary for success in it, then it will be necessary to delete Section 8 of this Act. One thing follows the other. Therefore, while I do not object to the deletion of parts (ii) and (iii) of clause (*e*) of Section 2, I would suggest that part (i) be suitably amended by adding the words which will make the exercise of skill a necessary ingredient for success in a competition which is to be defined as a prize competition so that the mere granting of a license by Government cannot make a prize competition lawful even if no skill is necessary for success in it. That is the very thing which the judgment of the High Court has pointed out. Therefore, if our amendment legislation is to give effect to the judgment of the High Court and the directions contained therein to suitably amend the Police Act, we will be failing in our duty to do so by leaving the definition as it is, retainning Section 8 in Act XXVII of 1951.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—I would like to have some clarification from the Hon'ble Minister before I am able to offer any remarks on this legislation. I wish to take the last point first and that is with reference to Section 7. What has been placed in our hands and what has been suggested in this Bill is an amendment to the Mysore Police Act. But what Section 7 says is that the Mysore Act XXVII of 1951 is to be amended in this Bill. Are we competent to do so? While seeking to amend the Mysore Police Act, you give us an Amending Bill to that effect, what you really do is indirectly to add provision in that Amending Bill that in clause (*e*) of sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act, 1951, sub-clause (ii) and (iii) shall be omitted in respect of which no amending Bill is placed in our hands. I would like to have this clarification before I am able to offer my remarks. It is a very legal matter. I would request the Hon'ble Minister to kindly enlighten me on that point.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, a very pertinent point has been raised by my esteemed friend Sri Pattabhiraman as to how clause 7 is competent in this Bill? Legal opinion has been taken on that point. We have been advised that so far as the legal opinion is concerned, in a given measure where amendments are introduced, amending another Act by means of the same Amending Legislation will not be illegal. That is the opinion that has been tendered, and, what is more, there are some instances where, in an Amending Provision or a Bill, various provisions of several Bills, it has been held, may be amended by means of one Amending Legislation.

11-30 A.M.

Further it has been notified in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill and I already read, I think, the relevant portion in the Judgment of His Lordship Sri Vasudevamurthy. Why clause 7 has been introduced, I shall explain presently.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I am in entire agreement with what my friend Sri Rama Rao has said. But this is the position. Let us look at the title of the Bill :

"Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Mysore Police

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

Act, 1908 (Mysore Act V of 1908):

"It is hereby enacted as follows:"

It is never the intention of the amending Bill to amend the Lotteries Act at all. But in the case of the Bill you introduce, there is a section amending the Lotteries Act. That is not your object at all. Is that the legal opinion?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Incidentally it happens that some other definition or some other clause in some other Act also comes under consideration and such amendments are permitted. It is held to be legal in the Centre and it has been the practice in this House also. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, on page 6, the following remark has been made:

> "This Bill has accordingly been brought forward. It seeks to amplify the definition relating to gaming so as to cover all forms of gaming and to make provision for more deterrent punishment in respect of gaming by amending Sections 4, 63, and 68 of the Mysore Police Act. Since the modified definition of gaming will cover prize competitions defined in sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 2 (1) (e) of the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act, 1951, these sub-clauses are proposed to be omitted."

Therefore, there has been sufficient notice given, no surprise is cast on this House and it is perfectly in order.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I still add something, Mr. Speaker. I must say frankly but with very great respect to the Hon'ble Minister that I remain unconvinced; but still I want to add this. If the object is that all forms of gaming should be comprehensively dealt with in a measure of this kind, the procedure, as I have understood, is to bring a legislation definite for the purpose. "Whereas it is expedient to make provision for prohibiting all forms of gaming in the State of Mysore, be it enacted by the Assembly, etc." That is the form of legislation. The specific suggestion made in this amending Bill is to amend the Mysore Police Act; nothing more and nothing less. Further, the Judgment of His Lordship Mr. Justice Vasudevamurthy is very helpful. His Lordship says, 'not only amend the Police Act but all the other Acts.' There is that definite indication to the Government. Still the Bill does not conform to it by seeking an amendment of all the laws in the matter. Only the other day we had a similar legislation before us. Various Municipal Acts in the State —the Town Municipalities Act, the Corporation of the City Act, etc.,— were sought to be amended by a single legislation. We never objected to that, because the legislation was clear; it was a comprehensive amendment of the entire municipal laws on the question. That is not what we find here. If it commends itself and if the Government has the authority or the legal opinion, I would certainly bow; still I remain unconvinced.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Only one remark I wish to make. Not merely it is included in the Statement of Objects but in the amending Bill itself at page 5:

> "7. Amendment of section 2 of Mysore Act XXVII of 1951.—In clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 2 of the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Control and Tax Act, 1951, sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) shall be omitted."

That is also specifically brought forward. Just as amending Bills referring to various Acts are clubbed together, the same principle and practice is followed here and with due respect to my friend, I feel there is nothing wrong or nothing illegal about

it. I therefore commend this measure.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Would I not be right in stating that the Statement of Objects and Reasons is generally not considered to be a part of the Bill ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I read part of the amending Bill itself at page 5. Therefore that objection also stands satisfied.

* Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I may add one word more to what my colleague has added, *viz.*, this is strictly in conformity with the decision of the High Court and they have clearly stated in so many words to amend the Police Act or the Mysore Lotteries and Prize Competitions Act of 1908. So far as section 2 is concerned, I have already made my submission that I want to make this foolproof and knaveproof. I do not want to give scope for anybody to seek protection. With that object it is absolutely necessary that section 2 of the Act which is merely consequential in nature is put in. Otherwise, a man could still find protection under those sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) if they have not been omitted. It is merely in the nature of a consequential amendment in order to make this provision effective. Therefore, very great care has been taken and as I have already said, I have been closely following on the heels of the Bombay and Madras Acts. Whatever is put there, I have taken and I have tried in obedience to the decision of the High Court, to make it a further improvement.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—I wish to add a few words to what has already been said by my learned friends Sri M. V. Rama Rao and Pattabhiraman. The Hon'ble Minister for Home has stated about the urgency for this measure. Before I speak on the Bill itself, I wish to say something about this type of gambling, *i.e.*, Satta. Some of my friends are not aquainted with it. This gaming has been popular in Bombay and a few persons from Bombay came over to Bangalore to conduct this gaming. There they seem to be flourishing well. In order to advertise this gaming, they opened a few centres in Bangalore and encouraged the people to bet by giving some money. It has already been said by the Home Minister. Since a year this gaming has become very popular in Bangalore City. There are in all 50 divisions in the City. In each division there are 200 to 300 centres; particularly I wish to say that in my division Chamarajpet, a small division, there are more than 300 centres. In the mornings they will be having some ordinary indoor games; and also these rooms will be occupied by students. In the nights, if you go after 9 o'clock, you can see large number of people standing in long queues to play this game, as the Hon'ble Minister has already said, and awaiting the results also, and sometimes it will be very difficult for the traffic to pass through, because these people will stand on the road itself. After the results would be announced, there would be quarrels also. As a matter of fact, I was about to congratulate the Government for having brought this Bill. But I wish Government had looked into all these matters before this Bill was introduced.

Sometimes, the man who runs the centre will fail to pay the money. He walks away with it. Many students who come to Bangalore are engaged in this game. That is why we are having a number of failures in the examinations. Some of the rooms in which the students live become gaming houses. In the mornings, students use the rooms for reading purposes and in the night gaming goes on there. This gaming affects the labour class particularly. When the husband is away at work during the day, the wife pledges away all her belongings and play the game. Sometimes foodstuffs are also sold away. Even old clothes are also either sold away or pledged. The

(SRI R. ANANTARAMAN.)

money they realise is utilised for playing this satta game. I would bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Minister that there were two cases of suicide in Cubbonpet. Both of them were ladies. When the husband was away during the day, the wife pledged all her jewels and she invested this money in the satta game and lost. Fearing the consequences after her husband's arrival, she sprinkled kerosene on her body and clothes and burnt herself to death. This game is played on the opening and closing rates of New York cotton. It is played in every division. Particularly in my division, there were no Marwadi shops two years ago. But now there are about two dozens—24. All the pawn shops are having good business on all the days.

There is one big centre by the side of Krishna Bhavan in Chickpet; between 7 and 8 in the night, there will be more than a thousand people standing. The whole traffic will be affected on this account. The people of Bangalore City, particularly the labour and poorer class, have lost all their belongings by either pledging or selling them away to play this game.

Another matter I wish to state is that even lawyers are affected by this gambling. Clerks of lawyers, whenever they receive money to be deposited in the courts from the clients, play on this game and lose. They will not be able to deposit the money in the courts and as such the reputation of lawyers is also at stake. Even before the decision given by Justice Vasudevamurthy, many representations were made to the Hon'ble Minister. He was kind enough to ask us to send some questions. Yesterday, my question came up and it was answered. On the 8th of July, Justice Vasudevamurthy gave a judgment in which he has given a direction for the amendment of Section 68 of the Police Act itself. My friend, Sri Rama Rao, has gone through this Act very carefully and has pointed out the lacuna. To me, Sir, according to the amendment of Section 4 of the Mysore Police Act of 1908, the definition of the word gaming—Sri Rama Rao says that there is some lacuna here—does not include lottery but includes all forms of wagering or betting; but the word wagering or betting has not been defined anywhere. As I said, in the Mysore Police Act, the definition of the word wagering or betting is not given. In which Act have we to look into just to find out the definition of the word wagering or betting? Would it not be better that the definition of this word is given in this Act, so that even a lay man will understand the definitions. If, as I suggested, the word wagering and betting is defined, it will be very easy for the courts and the laywers as well to argue.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The definition comes under the Contracts Act. You will find a reference to it there.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—No doubt, it comes under the Contracts Act. But I suggest to Government that it is better if the definition is brought forth in this Act itself. The present definition of gaming is: "gaming does not include a lottery but includes all forms of wagering or betting, except wagering or betting on a horse race when such wagering or betting takes place." Here, except the wagering or betting on horse races, other games will come, no doubt, under this Act itself. But would it not be better, Sir, while defining the word wagering or betting—wagering or betting must be so defined as to say that it may be any kind of speculation on an uncertain event. I once again suggest that the definition of the word wagering or betting should be included under this amending Bill itself.

Another thing is, and Sri Rama Rao has also pointed this out, the definition contained in the Police Act regarding gaming houses has been omitted in the present Bill. Why is

it that the words cards, dice, etc., which found a place in the Mysore Police Act are now removed? It would have been better if they had also been included. No doubt, the Hon'ble Minister said that such things come within the four corners of the definition in the present Bill. But, would it not be better to make it specific? Justice Sri Vasudevamurthy has said that the words gambling or wagering must be substituted by the word gaming. What has actually happened is, in that particular case, because the definition gambling does not include gaming, particularly this gaming on New York cotton market rates, the judge has suggested that the word gambling, or wagering must be substituted by the word gaming. The definition of the word gaming is not clear. It is not perfect. It needs improvement, as Sri Rama Rao said. I suggest that the definition may kindly be improved so that the amendment to Section 56 of the Mysore Police Act, 1908, may be clear.

As regards penalty prescribed for keeping any gaming house or for gaming therein, I feel it is not deterrent. For the first offence imprisonment shall not be less than one month and fine shall not be less than two hundred rupees. For a second offence, imprisonment shall not be less than three months and fine shall not be less than two hundred rupees, and for a third offence or a subsequent offence, imprisonment shall not be less than six months and fine shall not be less than two hundred rupees. The imprisonment and fine awarded are not deterrent for the offence committed. I suggest that a higher imprisonment sentence be given.

On the whole, as the learned Minister said, this Bill is very urgent. If it is postponed by about two or three months, I am afraid, there will be many deaths in Bangalore City, particularly of the weaker sex. They will commit suicide; also many people will lose their money. Many people have already lost all their money. We have no particular reason to postpone it also. This sort of gambling is worse than horse-racing, for the reason that it is run everyday throughout the year. It is better that the Bill is passed today itself and sent to the Upper House. With these few words, I heartily support the measure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I understand from the discussions so far that, due to a legal flaw in the particular Act, the accused was acquitted in the Hon'ble High Court of Mysore. It is due to that that this Bill is now prepared, *i.e.*, to overcome that legal flaw. Even in this Bill certain legal and technical doubts are raised by Sri Pattabhiraman and also by Sri M. V. Rama Rao in a way. Those points are not so clearly met. That is how it appears to me. Whatever that may be, if the Government are fully satisfied that the present Bill meets their purpose, they can pursue. Otherwise they may reconsider the Bill and take it up on Monday. It is left to the Government.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I must say that I have not pointed out any ground of a technical nature for requesting Government to bestow further thought upon this matter.

As a matter of fact now, my Hon'ble friend Sri Anantaraman made reference to clause 4 of the Bill which seeks to amend Section 56. I did not quite catch exactly, what he said with reference to clause (i). If the Hon'ble Minister will take pains to examine the clause . . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will assure the Member that I will take pains.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—If he will examine clause (i) of Section 56 of the Mysore Police Act of 1908 which he wants to amend by this Bill, he will find that the word 'gambling' does not exist there. I will read it for his information. Clause (i) of

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

Section 56 of Mysore Police Act reads like this :

> "Assembles with others or joins any assembly in a street gathered for the purpose of gaming or wagering."

These are the words used. Now it is pointed out here in the Bill . . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I may request my Hon'ble friend to please go to page 30. I have got 1953 Edition. I do not know which book he is referring to. Under Section 56 clause (i) you will find the following :—

> "Assembles with others or joins any Assembly in a street gathered for the purpose of gambling or wagering."

I want to substitute those words "gambling or wagering" by the word 'gaming' in order to enlarge its scope. That is all the object.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—In this particular edition we find the words 'gaming or wagery'.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am referring to the latest Act which is amended up to 1952. I do not know what the edition of that Act is. I will read the existing Section 56 clause (i) which is as follows :—

> "Assembles with others or joins any Assembly in a street gathered for the purpose of gambling or wagering."

I want to substitute these words "gambling or wagering" by the word 'gaming'. That is only a simple amendment.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I am reading the Police Act which has been printed in the same Government Press and the very Act which is in force. The word 'gaming' is already there.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—In the latest edition which is with me, the word 'gaming' is not found in this clause. It says only :

> "joins any Assembly in a street gathered for the purpose of gambling or wagering."

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Are we to take it that it is a possible error in printing or the word 'gaming' has been amended by a subsequent amendment ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There is no printer's devil. So far as I can say, very possibly that might have been amended because the old Act of 1908 has been subject to several amendments from year to year. I do not know in what year there was amendment, if that word finds a place in your book. But you may take this as the latest.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—It is not my book. This book belongs to the Legislative Assembly Library.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—It is for the Minister to say when the word 'gaming' has been omitted without telling us 'in my book the word is not there'. Let him look for it as to how that is omitted and for what reason and was it ever amended at all.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I am always prepared to do my duty properly. The only position is this : So far as that particular clause is concerned, I am now given to understand that the word 'gaming' finds a place in some other edition. As a matter of fact I have not looked into the old edition at all. I have been basing my argument with reference to my latest edition. I will examine how it has been omitted.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I would like to submit this. What my Hon'ble friend Sri Pattabhiraman said was only this, if I can understand him correctly ; there is the title head to the Bill as 'Mysore Police (Second) Amendment Bill, 1953 and there are several clauses in this. Are we to understand that the several clauses do apply to Police Act or the Lotteries Act is the question. If there was another title given and another clause added, that would be a different thing. Would this clause 7 go to Police Amendment Act ? Evidently, because the title is that.

By merely putting a clause in this Bill, can we amend the Lotteries Act ? If you had said : " whereas it is expedient and necessary to amend such and such Acts, then it would be a different thing. You should have said : " whereas it is expedient to amend Mysore Police Act of 1908 and also Lotteries Act." You have not stated so here. But in clause 7, you simply say instead of these words add these words. Do you intend putting this clause in the Police Act or do you intend putting this clause in the Lotteries Act is the question. Would merely putting a clause like clause 7 in the Police Act bring about the desired effect is the question. You do not want clause 7 to be put in the Police Act. You want this to be put in the Lotteries Act. If that is the case, that should be clause 1 for the Lotteries Act and not clause 7 for the Police Act. That is what I think my friend said. I do not know what his feeling is. Whatever it is, I heard with rapt attention the pitiable incidents narrated by Sri Anantaraman. Certainly this must be put an end to here and now, and we cannot allow it to continue. But is that a reason for us to usher through an amendment and bring in this Bill everything ? Should not the Legislature carefully go through these things ? These are offences not like those found in the Civil Procedure Code or any other Act where there is no honour at stake. But here the question is any honourable man who holds some cards packet and stands somewhere just to take it to his club will be punishable, because he holds those articles. These are matters in which we should be very careful. I do not think if he brings a Bill for this tomorrow or day after tomorrow, by then the Mysore State will become insolvent by all these people wagering all their money. That is not the question. The question is : let us carefully go through this thing ; let us frame a law which is correct, and bestow due care and attention to it. I am only suggesting whether they could not send it to a Select Committee and there they can go through the whole thing. Instead of bringing this Bill on Monday, bring it on another day. The Government may also re-consider the whole thing and frame it properly and then intrduce it. The urgency is not so great as to permit of lacuna in the Bill and improperly frame it.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will answer in one sentence to what my learned friend Sri Bheemappa Naik said. I am certainly one of those who also believe that no improper thing should be done. I am really astonished that a storm in a tea cup is raised.— I expected that a simple and innocuous measure like this would receive the assent of this House.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I never intended a storm.

12 NOON.

* Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I fully appreciate that no measure should be pushed through and rushed through. I entirely understand that position. Nor is it the intention of the Government that any legislative measure should be rushed through. But so far as one point is concerned, I thought the explanation of my Hon'ble colleague, the Minister for Law, has satisfied the Member. But I may say, without looking into these things we do not bring it. I may say at once there is the legal opinion ; there is a special branch in the Secretariat which advises the Government in all these matters.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Are we to take it that when once the legal opinion is taken, this House has no more say in the matter or no scrutiny need be made by this House ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I never said that. I do not know how my friend jumps to conclusions which cannot be warranted. But what I am saying is, so far as Government are concerned, they are perfectly satisfied that any law that we are now framing by this amending Bill is

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

not illegal. No court can hold that because by clause 7 the amendment of the Lotteries Act is conceived, it is *ultra vires*. That is what we have been advised; I am saying it by having in view the precedents and practice both at the Centre and here. So many Bills I can bring and show to you. If a suggestion is made whether it would not be advisable to make a separate amendment in the Lotteries Act to that particular provision instead of bringing it here, I can very well understand the position. But I may at once submit, I thought it was purely by way of a consequential amendment, in view of what is now sought to be amended by this Bill, and by the mere failure or omission to put it in the Mysore Police (Second Amendment) Bill or the Lotteries Bill, I do not think the effect of the law that we are now going to pass will in any way be declared as *ultra vires* or anything by way of making an in validating clause. And what is more, as my friend the Minister for Law has already submitted to this House, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has also been mentioned why this provision is sought. Perhaps it might have been better, it could have been distinctly beter if a separate amendment had been brought. I can very well understand that position, but if it is said that it is going to be illegal or *ultra vires*, I am clothed, fortified and armed by the legal opinion that it cannot be.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Now that we are at it, apart from the legal implications, I leave the matter in the safe hands of the Government, it being the responsibility of the Party in power; but one thing that I would like the Minister for Home to answer is this. Sri Rama Rao has raised a very important issue before us. If by virtue of this section, you would seek for the deletion of these two sub-clauses (ii) and (iii) in that Act, he has also shown how the effect of this would be to leave the first part of it unprotected annd hence the lacunæ. He has also pointed out that in that event, necessity would arise for amending clause 1 of the Act, for substantially some of the doubts which deserve consideration are there.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Certainly I will examine, I will look into the aspect and I will try to find out whether clause 1 requires any amendment in the proposed way in which I want to delete these sub-clauses (ii) and (iii).

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Would any harm be done if we delete clause 7 and leave the matter for further consideration? Why it should not commend itself to the Government, I ask.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I will look into it. In the light of several points that have been raised, may I make an humble suggestion? You may be able to give time, for this Bill on Monday. Now I understand that Hon'ble Members feel that something more needs to be done. I welcome any amendment if it is moved. In the meanwhile, I shall also try to go through the whole thing once again, not once, but twice and I humbly request you to give priority to this in Monday's business and it may be taken up on Monday at least.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In fact, some of the Hon'ble Members who took part so far in the debate on this Bill did not deny the importance and urgency of the Bill. But their only point is, when it becomes a law, it must be perfect. It must be carefully examined. That was all the point that was raised by the Hon'ble Members. In view of these things, this may be taken up on Monday as the first item of business.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—How about our amendments?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Government have said that they will examine the

Bill carefully once again and if need be, they themselves would place amendments before the House.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE RAJPRAMUKH TO INTRODUCE AND MOVE BILLS.

(1) *The Mysore Ministers' Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill,* 1953.

(2) *The Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill,* 1953.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received an Order :

"In pursuance of sub-clause (3) of Article 207 of the Constitution of India, I, Jayachamarajendra Wadiyar, Rajpramukh of Mysore, do hereby recommend that the Mysore Ministers' Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be considered by the Mysore Legislative Assembly."

Another Order :

"In pursuance of sub-clause 3 of Article 207 of the Constitution of India, I, Jayachamarajendra Wadiyar, Rajpramukh of Mysore, do hereby recommend that the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be considered by the Mysore Legislative Assembly."

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I think we are about to close at 12-30. The Appropriation Bill is a very important part of the business. If it is moved when the days sitting is about to be closed, then I am afraid we will not be able to do full justice.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I may submit that at the time of grants it has been discussed threadbare.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I want at least half an hour or three-fourths of an hour. On a day when the Appropriation Bill is to be discussed, no other business has to be taken up because there are so many items with which we have not dealt. We have to express our opinion and it cannot be rushed through so easily within 15 minutes. I think I would request that this Bill may be taken up some other day.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I feel the importance, but in view of the fact that the Grants have been fully discussed, I am feeling that more time would not be necessary. I leave it to the Chair.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Grants are not fully discussed. That will take a long time. You have been asking for a sum of Rs. 6 crores and odd and you cannot expect us to vote the entire 6 crores within 15 minutes, especially on some of the items, on loans and other items. Under the Constitution we can express our opinion. So I do not want this Bill to be hurried through within 15 minutes.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I leave it to the Chair. But only I submit that this sum of Rs. 6 crores, though the figure is big, the bulk of it is by way of ways and means.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yesterday it was discussed.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Charged items were not discussed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will leave it to the House, whether we should take it to-day or on Monday.

MYSORE MINISTERS' SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Ministers' Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1953, be taken into consideration."